PROPERTY OF THE
LIBRARY OF THE

FACTS ON FILE
WORLD NEWS DIGEST WITH INDEX

Reg. U.S. Pat. Off. Published Weekly in 2 Sections—Section 1
Vol. XIV, No. 724 September 10-16, 1954

SEP 20 1954
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Week in Headlines

International

Dulles reaffirmed U.S. intention to bar Red invasion of Formosa, said SEATO based on concept of mobile defense against aggression.

Eden visited Italy, Dulles flew to Europe for negotiations on re-arming West Germany.

Russia sought accord with Japan.

U.S. suggested Intl. Court weigh Soviet-U.S. plane clashes.

1,600 died in Algerian 'quake.

United States

Watkins Com. completed hearings on McCarthy censure charges.

Democrat won Maine Governorship; national party leaders opened Congressional campaigns.

Govt. outlined drive against Communist Party under new laws.

Federal crop controls relaxed.

Budget deficit estimate revised upward due to tax slump.

WORLD AFFAIRS

FAR EAST

Dulles Assures Formosa

Says Red Assault Would Fail

U.S. State Secy. John Foster Dulles said Sept. 12 that the Chinese Communists seemed to have no plans for an early invasion of Formosa. He declared that the Reds could not seize the Nationalist stronghold "under any circumstances" against "such opposition as we would interpose."

He offered "no opinion" about a possible Red attempt to take Quemoy. But he said the abatement of shelling from the Chinese mainland (see col. 2) indicated that the Communists did not have "any military intentions of invasion" of Quemoy in the near future. Dulles made his remarks at a news conference in Denver, where he had reported on Asia to Pres. Eisenhower & the Natl. Security Council.[1]

Dulles Sees Chiang

Dulles visited Nationalist Pres. Chiang Kai-shek in Taipeh, Formosa Sept. 9 on his way back to the U.S. from the Manila conference on Asian defense. He assured the Nationalists that they did not "stand alone" against Communist aggression and said the U.S. would not be "intimidated" by intensified Red military & propaganda activities. Dulles said Sept. 12 in Denver "no commitments" were sought by or given to Chiang.

(Sen. H. Alexander Smith [R., N.J.], who visited Formosa with Dulles, told Washington reporters Sept. 13: Chiang had urged the U.S. to give him the "green light" for an invasion of the Chinese mainland but "would not dare attack" without U.S. approval & support.)

Dulles told newsmen in Denver Sept. 12: he was "hopeful" that a general war in the Pacific could be avoided; his talks with Chiang & Japanese Prime Min. Shigeru Yoshida (in Tokyo Sept. 10) "very usefully" supplemented his Washington talks with South Korean Pres. Syngman Rhee on Far Eastern policy.[2]

U.S. Policies Affirmed

Pres. Eisenhower said Sept. 13 he had called the Natl. Security Council to confer with Dulles on "the place of the U.S. in . . . the Western Pacific." The Council, meeting outside Washington for the first time, set no new policies but reaffirmed previous decisions. This included, Mr. Eisenhower said: (1) "to make better partners of old friends," (2) "to get new friends wherever we can" and (3) "where our vital interests demand it, to support them in their security & in their own interests."[3]

Nationalists Continue Attacks

Nationalist sea & air bombardment of Communist installations along the Fukien coast of the mainland continued for the 13th day Sept. 15. Red positions on Tateng Island, north of Quemoy, & Tungshan peninsula, 70 mi. south, also were attacked. Communist gunfire was confined to sporadic shelling of Quemoy & Little Quemoy. The Nationalists said they drove off Red "frogmen" who landed on Quemoy early Sept. 14.

Nationalist warships set up a 160-mi. patrol Sept. 12 from Swatow (125 mi. s.w. of Quemoy) to Chinchu Bay (35 mi. n.e.) to guard against Red landing craft. Maj. Gen. William C. Chase, chief of the U.S. Military Aid Advisory Group to Formosa, inspected Quemoy's defenses Sept. 11.[5]

★ ★ ★

7th Fleet Orders Reported

The *N.Y. Herald Tribune* said Sept. 13 that the Eisenhower Admin. had ordered the U.S. 7th Fleet to give "full logistic support" to Chinese Nationalists in defense of Quemoy. This meant all aid short of American manpower in actual combat, the report said. State Secy. Dulles, asked at a news conference Sept. 12 about the 7th Fleet's orders regarding Quemoy, said only this: "The 7th Fleet has orders."[4]

★ ★ ★

Dulles Reports on SEATO

In a broadcast report to the U.S. public Sept. 15, Dulles said the Manila conference had, in effect, indorsed the American policy of "deterrent power" with which to retaliate against aggression "by means & at places of our own choosing." His radio-TV talk was recorded since he had flown to Europe earlier that day for conferences on European unity.

Dulles said the Manila conferees discarded the idea of creating a joint military (NATO-type) force for defending Southeast Asia & the Pacific because U.S. "responsibilities were so vast & far-flung that we believed that we would serve best . . . by developing the deterrent of mobile striking power, plus strategically placed reserves." The Asian pact would not require any "material changes" in U.S. defense plans, Dulles added, because "those plans already call for [maintenance] at all times [of] powerful naval & air forces in the Western Pacific capable of striking at any aggressor by means & at places of our choosing." This "deterrent power . . . can protect many as effectively as it protects one," he said.[6]

(The Soviet Foreign Ministry denounced the Southeast Asian pact Sept. 14 as a "bloc of colonial powers based on imperialist objectives" contrary to "the interests of the security of Asia & the Far East.")[7]

Russia Asks Tokyo Ties

Soviet Forgn. Min. Vyacheslav M. Molotov charged Sept. 13 that the U.S. was trying to keep Japan "in the status of a dependent country." He said Russia was ready to restore normal relations with Japan. The Japanese Govt. offered same day to conclude a peace pact with Russia along lines of the San Francisco Treaty with Western nations.[8]

Viet Nam Govt., Army Split

South Viet Namese Premier Ngo Dinh Diem dismissed Army Chief of Staff Gen. Nguyen Van Hinh Sept. 11 and ordered him to leave the country by Sept. 14. The Army Chief said he was willing to go to France for 6 months of "study & rest." There was no indication, however, that Nguyen Van Minh would relinquish his official functions. Natl. Defense Secy. Le

1—see p. 297C3 2—see p. 258G2 3—see p. 262F1 4—see p. 298C2 5—see p. 298D1 6—see pp. 297B1, 9B1 7—see p. 297G3 8—see Vol. XIII, p. 163B (Consult Index by name & subject for other background references)

FOF ADVISORY BOARD

Letters: Prof. A. J BARNOUW, Columbia
Medical Science: Dr. EDWARD C. BRENNER
Political Science: Prof. FRANCIS W. COKER, Yale
Economics: Prof. J. ANTON DE HAAS, Claremont
Science: DAVID DIETZ, Scripps-Howard Newspapers
Education: Dr. HARRY D. GIDEONSE, Pres. B'klyn Coll
History: JOHN GUNTHER
News Analysis: H. V. KALTENBORN
World Affairs: WILLIAM L. SHIRER
Law: Dr. FRANK HENRY SOMMERS, formerly N.Y.U.
Latin America: Prof. FRANK TANNENBAUM, Columbia
Library Service: Dr. C. C. WILLIAMSON, Columbia

Ngee Chan said Sept. 13 he would act as Chief of Staff temporarily.

The open break between the Govt. & its military leader stemmed from a disagreement over means of fighting communism in south Viet Nam. The military maintained that the Govt. was too weak to control the Reds and only a strong political campaign headed by the Army could be effective. Nguyen Van Minh reportedly had French backing.[1]

(Brig. Gen. Christian de Castries arrived incognito in Paris Sept. 10 for a 10-day visit. He saw Premier Pierre Mendès-France Sept. 13.)[2]

UN Hears U.S. Complaint

The U.S. called for UN Security Council action Sept. 10 on Soviet attacks on American planes flying over international territory. The formal complaint, filed Sept. 9, dealt specifically with the shooting down of a U.S. Navy plane off Siberia Sept. 4.

U.S. Amb.-to-UN Henry Cabot Lodge Jr. told the Security Council that the Sept. 4 incident was part of a series of unprovoked attacks on U.S. planes by Soviet airmen. He said the U.S. wanted to settle the problem through peaceful negotiation but might take the matter to the World Court if direct talks with Russia were not satisfactory.

Soviet delegate Andrei Y. Vishinsky ruled out a UN investigation of the matter. He maintained that it was not the business of the Security Council. He charged that the U.S. had brought the case before the UN to alarm public opinion & increase world tension. Vishinsky said the U.S. plane violated Soviet frontiers to spy by radar on Soviet installations and was downed over Soviet territory.

The U.S. was supported in its complaint by Britain, France, Natl. China, New Zealand, Turkey, Denmark & Colombia. Sir Pierson Dixon of Britain censured Russia's "trigger-happy attitude" of shooting "without provocation of foreign aircraft . . . anywhere remotely near Soviet territory." He said it was "most desirable that there should be a strong & widespread . . . reaction against such unwarranted acts."[3]

Red China Frees Americans

3 Americans arrested off Hong Kong Mar. 21, 1953 by Chinese Reds who halted their yacht were freed in Hong Kong Sept. 15. They had been imprisoned in China for 18 months on charges of violating Chinese territorial waters. The men: Richard Applegate, 42, of Medford, Ore., an NBC correspondent and owner of the yacht; Donald Dixon (born Ditchik), 27, of New York, an INS reporter; Merch. Marine Capt. Benjamin Krasner, of Brooklyn, who was teaching Applegate how to sail the yacht when it was seized by the Reds.

Applegate gave this account of their imprisonment: They were taken to the Red-held island of Lapsapwei immediately after their arrest, to Swabue in Kwangtung Province a week later, then to Canton where they were held prisoners in a private house until November. Since then they had been held in separate, vermin-infested prisons in Canton, subjected to semi-starvation & brainwashings and released only after they had "confessed" that the U.S. used germ warfare in Korea. Applegate had malaria twice, Dixon once during imprisonment. When released the 3 men, especially Krasner, were weak from undernourishment and wearing the now ragged clothes they had on when taken prisoner.

The last appeal for their freedom, following several appeals initiated by the U.S. Govt., was made by Mrs. Frank Applegate, the correspondent's mother, through British Labor Party leader Clement R. Attlee on his recent visit to Peiping. Krasner said he would remain in Hong Kong to try to negotiate the release of his Chinese fiancée, Wang Ying, who was arrested aboard the yacht. The Reds also still held 2 Chinese boat boys.[4]

U.S. 'Spy' Imprisoned for Life

Hugh F. Redmond, of Yonkers, N.Y., employe of the Henningsen export-import firm of Shanghai, was sentenced to life imprisonment as a U.S. spy. Peiping radio announced Sept. 13. The Reds said Redmond, who was arrested in April 1951, had "engaged in espionage" in Mukden, Peking & Shanghai. 7 persons with Chinese names also were sentenced (2 to death) as U.S. spies. The U.S. State Dept. said Redmond was a "legitimate" business man.

WEST EUROPE

Eden Offers German Plan

British Forgn. Secy. Anthony Eden visited Brussels, Bonn, Rome & Paris seeking support for Britain's plan to overcome the collapse of EDC; bring West Germany & Italy into the 1948 Brussels Treaty* as fully-sovereign members. The British plan was designed to offset German demands for equality as a partner in Western defense, and French opposition to supranational features of the French-rejected EDC.

Eden first flew to Brussels Sept. 11 to see Belgian Forgn. Min. Paul-Henri Spaak & Luxembourg's Forgn. Min. John W. Boyen & Premier Joseph Bech. The latter 3 declared themselves unopposed to rearming West Germany under terms of the North Atlantic Treaty as long as German forces remained controlled.

Eden conferred Sept. 12 in Bonn with West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer who was reported favorably disposed to entering the NATO alliance if full sovereignty were granted West Germany. Adenauer told an election rally in Neumuenster, Schleswig-Holstein Sept. 10 that the German people would accept self-imposed restrictions on rearmament if full sovereignty were granted.

(Adenauer's Christian Dems. dropped from first to 2d position in the state of Schleswig-Holstein via a setback in legislative elections there Sept. 12. Social Dems., who had emphasized reunification of Germany before its integration into a Western defense alliance, made the "failure" of Adenauer's pro-EDC foreign policy a major campaign issue. They polled 33.2% of the total vote. Adenauer's party received 32.2% or 13.9% less than in 1953.)[5]

In Rome Sept. 14, Eden & Italian Forgn. Min. Attilio Piccioni issued a joint statement declaring that "close European union . . . in defense of the free world" could best be effected by associating West Germany with the Western nations.

Eden conferred with French Premier Pierre Mendès-France in Paris Sept. 15. It was reported that Mendès-France was holding out for guarantees against a revival of German militarism.[6]

Council of Europe Offers Plan

The 15-nation Council of Europe recommended in Strasbourg Sept. 14 formation of a European defense organization closely allied to NATO and including West German & British troops. The proposal was put forth as a substitute for EDC which would gain support of the French, West German, Italian, British & Benelux parliaments.[7]

Dulles to Europe

U.S. State Secy. John Foster Dulles, just back from the Manila SEATO conference & visits to Formosa & Japan, flew to Bonn Sept. 16 for talks with Adenauer on German rearmament through NATO. He intended to then see British leaders in London. His route pointedly omitted Paris.[8]

(Libya & U.S. signed an agreement in Bengazi Sept. 9 under which the U.S. would get long-term rights to air bases [particularly Wheelus at Tripoli] in exchange for annual economic aid. The U.S. agreed to pay Libya $5 million & 24,000 tons of wheat this year, then $2 million a year for 20 yrs.)[9]

West Rejects Soviet Talks

The U.S., Britain & France told Russia in notes Sept. 10 they saw no justification for new Big 4 talks on European security (proposed by Russia) unless Russia reversed its policy on German unification & an Austrian treaty. Russia had renewed its bid for a general European collective security pact Sept. 9 in a Moscow Forgn. Ministry statement praising France's "patriotic" rejection of EDC.[10]

*50-yr. pact on military, economic & cultural collaboration signed by Britain, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg. Armed forces of those countries, unified under Brussels pact (but not placed under supranational control), were in turn committed to NATO defense in 1949. [See Vols. IX, p. 225K; VIII, 85C] 1—see p. 265F1 2—298F3 3—298F2 4—Vol. XIII, 137F 5—p. 228B3 6—299B3 7—Vol. XIII, 316A2 8—pp. 305C1 9—p. 107A1; Vol. XIII, 420A2 10—pp. 290E1, 259E2

FACTS ON FILE is published weekly by Facts on File, Inc., 516 Fifth Ave., New York 36, N. Y. (MUrray Hill 2-5523-4). Entered as 2d class matter June 24, 1941 at the Post Office in New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription $70 a year; Yearbooks (bound volumes) from 1941—$25 each. Cumulative Index published twice a month. Copyright 1954 by Facts on File, Inc. Edw. Van Westerborg, Pres.-Treas.; Fred McGhee, Secy.-Editor; C. M. Schwartz, Business Manager.

McCARTHY

Censure Hearings End

Hearings on a resolution to censure Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R., Wis.) were ended Sept. 13 by a special Senate committee headed by Sen. Arthur V. Watkins (R., Utah).[1] 12 witnesses were heard during 9 days of testimony, about 280,000 words spoken.[2]

McCarthy's defense boiled down largely to this: he admitted most of the specific actions attributed to him but argued that all were justified and many done as his duty.

These were his answers to the 5 categories of charges against him:

(1) *Contempt of the Senate or a Senate committee* (by refusing Privileges & Elections Subcom. invitations to attend hearings on charges against him). The subcommittee did not invite McCarthy. It said he could appear if he wanted. He replied that he would appear if ordered. The subcommittee exceeded its authority, acted illegally, may not have been a legal body.

(2) *Encouragement of U.S. employes to violate the law & their oaths of office or Executive Orders* (by giving him classified data without authority). McCarthy had a right & duty to demand any information on wrongdoing in Govt.; Govt. employes were duty-bound to give it to him.

(3) *Receipt or use of confidential or classified information from Executive files* (specifically a 2¼-page document aparently abstracted from an FBI memo). McCarthy had a right to any information on wrongdoing. The specific document contained no security information. He did not consider it classified.

(4) *Abuse of Senate colleagues.* McCarthy had a right & duty to state his mind off the Senate floor.

(5) *Abusive treatment of Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker.* "Vigorous" questioning was necessary because Zwicker was evasive, arrogant, irritating.

★ ★ ★

Summary of Hearings

5th Day—Sept. 8

Lawton Refuses Answers

Maj. Gen. Kirke Brooks Lawton, ex-Ft. Monmouth commander, was called to the stand by Edward Bennett Williams, Sen. McCarthy's lawyer. But Lawton refused to discuss a talk with Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker in Nov. or Dec. 1953. He cited a May 17 Presidential letter "which prohibits members of the Executive Dept. from revealing conversations with employes thereof." Lawton was accompanied by John E. Pernice, chief of the legal division of the Army's Signal Office.

Williams said that the May 17 directive "referred only to the [Senate] Govt. Operations Com. & . . . the Army-McCarthy hearing." Lawton said that, according to "advice from counsel & other sources . . . that directive not only applied to the so-called Mundt Com. but . . . to this or any other." He refused, "on the basis [of] the same directive," to tell with whom he had discussed this.

Lawton also refused to answer Williams' queries as to whether he had (a) talked to Defense Dept. Gen. Counsel Wilbur M. Brucker and (b) been "prepared to testify on this subject" before seeing Brucker. But Lawton admitted he had told Williams about his conversation with Zwicker before he received legal advice.

[Brucker said in a statement: "Gen. Lawton came to me at his own request . . . to inquire whether he was still bound by the Presidential directive . . . since he had retired. . . . I advised him, as a legal matter, he, as a retired officer on inactive duty subject to recall, was still governed by the directive. . . . (The Defense Dept.) is making no effort whatever to influence Gen. Lawton's testimony in any manner not covered by the Presidential directive." Lawton, asked by newsmen why he felt bound by the directive, said he had to eat.]

Williams Denounces 'Gag'

Williams charged that the Defense Dept. was "gagging" a witness who had "relevant & germane" information. He said the advice Lawton followed was "incompetent" or "not given in good faith." He called it "absurd" to block the inquiry from information with "no more relationship to national security . . . than the price of yogurt." He said he criticized not Lawton but whoever gave "this wholly incompetent advice."

Sen. Francis Case (R., S.D.), a committee member, said the President's directive was based on the "principle that employes in the Executive Branch must be in position to be completely candid in advising each other, that it is not in the public interest [to reveal] conversations between them." He thought this principle could not "be maintained unless it were applicable to other cases" than the McCarthy-Army hearings.[3]

Sen. Edwin C. Johnson (D., Colo.) said if national security were not involved, "it seems to me that this committee is being deprived of information that it should have."

McCarthy Called 'S.O.B.'

Williams' 2d witness was William J. Harding Jr., 60, head of a New York "sales agency." Harding testified: He & Zwicker had sat near each other as spectators at McCarthy's interrogation of ex-Maj. Irving Peress in New York Feb. 18. McCarthy had asked Zwicker to answer a few questions. When Zwicker sat down, "I distinctly heard him mutter, under his breath, 'You s.o.b.'" McCarthy interrogated Zwicker later that day.

Williams read the exchange between McCarthy & Zwicker prior to the alleged "s.o.b." remark. In the exchange: McCarthy said Peress was being considered for "sensitive work" in May 1953 "after it was fully known that he was a Communist." He asked Zwicker what this work was. Zwicker said he did not know. McCarthy asked him to "have somebody call Camp Kilmer [which Zwicker then commanded][4] and find out." Zwicker said he would not be able to give McCarthy the information because of an order "which forbids us to discuss [such] matters."

At the request of committee counsel Guy G. DeFuria, Williams also read this reply by McCarthy to Zwicker: ". . . You will be in difficulty if you refuse to tell us what sensitive work a Communist was being considered for. . . . You will be ordered to make available that information."

McCarthy on Zwicker

McCarthy took the stand and, under Williams' questioning, reviewed the Peress case & his interrogation of Zwicker. According to McCarthy:

Peress testified that the "sensitive work" he (a dentist) applied for was on "sensitive teeth"—"which did not make any sense to me [McCarthy]." After Zwicker refused to find out what the work was, McCarthy said Zwicker would be authorized to discuss it with permission of the Asst. Chief of Staff, G-2 (Intelligence). Zwicker refused to request such permission.

James N. Juliana, a McCarthy Com. investigator, had interviewed Zwicker "several days prior" to the Feb. 18 hearing and had reported to McCarthy that "Zwicker said that he had objected" to Peress' honorable discharge.

Zwicker's testimony during McCarthy's interrogation was "in complete conflict with other testimony . . . [&] with the reports gotten from the investigation."

"I [McCarthy] said he was not fit to wear the uniform of a general. . . . I said it then. I will say it now. I will say it again."

". . . He was one of the most arrogant . . . evasive . . . irritating" witnesses "I have ever had."[1]

Quiz on Procedures

Sen. Frank Carlson (R., Kan.), a committee member, noted that during McCarthy's hearings, witnesses were cross-examined by Harold E. Rainville & Robert Jones, administrative aides to Sens. Everett M. Dirksen (R., Ill.) & Charles E. Potter (R., Mich.). Carlson questioned the propriety of this. McCarthy said, "Whenever a man was present representing a Senator, I felt that he should be entitled to ask questions." He conceded that whether this was "proper" was "open to debate."

Under questioning by Sen. Arthur V. Watkins (R., Utah), committee chairman, McCarthy said: "There should be considerable latitude in cross-examination. That is the only way you can get at the facts." "You certainly should not abuse the witness," "but there are times when . . . you must get very vigorous," as "when you know that a witness is not telling

1—see p. 299E2 2—see p. 209A3 3—see p. 299F2 4—see p. 277F1

the truth . . . is hiding the facts." In Zwicker's case, McCarthy's "vigorous" tactics when "I thought the general was not telling me the truth" resulted in Zwicker's changing his testimony.

6th Day—Sept. 9

Comment on Witnesses Barred

Williams sought to read Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black's comments on handling evasive witnesses. But Watkins ruled against this and directed that testimony resume.

Data Requests Defended

McCarthy, under Williams' questioning, agreed that during the McCarthy-Army hearings he had made statements in effect inviting Govt. employes to give him information on wrongdoing because "their loyalty to their country" "towers far above any Presidential secrecy directive."[1] But he added: "I was not asking for general classified information," only "for evidence of wrongdoing. I was asking [them] to conform with the criminal code which requires they give" it.

McCarthy read Sec. 4, U.S. Code, which prescribed punishment for anyone who knows "of the actual commission of a felony" yet "conceals & does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority." He cited a Supreme Court ruling to show that he fell within the category "civil authority." He insisted that "the head of a department cannot hide wrongdoing" by rubber stamping evidence with some secrecy classification.

Others Ignored Classifications

McCarthy said that Vice Pres. Nixon, Justice Black & Sen. John J. Williams (R., Del.) had taken positions similar to his on classified data. He reported that Black, as Senator & Govt. Investigations Com. chairman in 1934, had investigated a munitions manufacturer who stamped his documents "Confidential by order of the War Dept." Black's committee ignored the stamp, McCarthy said.

Williams then attempted to question McCarthy about a statement Sen. Williams had made on this general subject, but Watkins stopped him and advised him to stick "to the law." Watkins said controversy over the issue of Congressional access to Executive information had existed "for many years" and "we could go off into the bypaths here for hours & days" if they discussed everything Senators had done & said in the past. Furthermore, Watkins said, "Just because somebody else did some of these things is no indication it was always right."

Dispute on Citing Precedents

Williams said he was trying to show that McCarthy's stand was "not unprecedented" but was "an expression of a solid Constitutional position" taken by McCarthy with the knowledge that other Senators & committee chairmen had acted as he did.

Watkins said Williams had been permitted to file a brief and would be allowed "oral argument" later. But he denied that precedents involving other Senators were properly part of McCarthy's testimony. Taking such testimony, he indicated, would force them to bring in the other Senators "to see whether they did get [such] information from Executive departments." He said McCarthy could not "testify personally" to that.

But Williams insisted that "it [precedents] is the most relevant part of the testimony" because it bore on the question of whether McCarthy "did a willful & intentional wrong." He said Watkins' ruling against McCarthy testifying on precedents involving individual Senators "goes to the very heart of this defense" and "effectively prevents us from putting in a defense."

McCarthy asked for "30 seconds" to support Williams' argument. Watkins called his attention to the committee rule that he & his counsel could not both argue a single issue, but he waived the rule and permitted McCarthy to speak.

McCarthy's argument: He was trying to show that "I was entitled to rely upon what eminent Senators . . . had urged Govt. employes to do, that there was nothing different in what I did from what the Vice President did and, in fact, the Vice President went much further than I did." The committee "should know whether I was establishing a new practice" or following precedent "that I knew . . . had never been questioned" but "had been relied upon by the Senate, approved by the Senate."

McCarthy urged Watkins to "go in a huddle" with the rest of the committee to see whether the other members backed his decision.

Committee Upholds Ruling

Williams obtained a 20-minute recess, and the committee went into executive session. Then Watkins announced that the committee upheld his decision unanimously. He said the committee would "permit precedents, actions of the Senate or any official group within the Senate," but rejected the "endless job" of considering "actions of individual Senators" because "you can find some precedent for almost anything under the sun when it comes to statements & activities of Senators & Congressmen."

Williams said this ruling "effectively prevents us from introducing the evidence which we believe constitutes the very heart & soul of our defense on the charges with respect to solicitation [of data]" & "with respect to the FBI letter."

Nixon Incident Cited

Williams said that "one of the most important parts of our case" concerned Vice Pres. Nixon when he was a member of the House Un-American Activities Com. in 1948.

According to Williams: The House committee included a classified FBI letter in one of its reports. It was charged that the committee's copy was incomplete, and Nixon asked the House Apr. 22, 1948 to get the letter from the FBI. Opponents argued that this "was in the teeth of the secrecy order of Pres. Truman," but Nixon told the House that the "secrecy order was unconstitutional." The House did not act on Nixon's denunciation of the secrecy directive. But, "by a vote of 522 to nothing," it asked "for the letter from the FBI on which the charge centered, the charge having been that the House committee had gotten the letter through illegal channels."*

Watkins said the committee would consider the House action "for whatever its weight is" although House action "doesn't control the Senate." But he said Nixon's speech was not "relevant testimony here."

Contempt Charge Denied

Williams presented 2 briefs: (1) an argument that the 83d Congress had no power to consider charges against McCarthy relating to his actions in the 82d Congress; (2) a denial that McCarthy was in contempt of the Senate Privileges & Elections Subcom. when it investigated him in 1951-52.

McCarthy said he had received no request or demand to appear at the Elections Subcom.'s hearings but had been told he could appear if he wanted. He said he replied that he would appear if ordered.[2] At Williams' request, McCarthy read correspondence between himself & the subcommittee in which McCarthy asked for the right to question witnesses. Chrmn. Guy M. Gillette (D., Ia.) replied that only subcommittee members had the right to cross-examine.

McCarthy said that ex-Sen. William Benton (D., Conn.) testified against session although McCarthy had been him before the subcommittee in open "notified that Benton would appear in executive session."[3] He charged that the subcommittee exceeded its jurisdiction by investigating matters prior to his election although the resolution for the inquiry restricted it to "acts . . . since my election."[4]

McCarthy testified that Daniel G. Buckley, ex-Elections Subcom. investigator, had told him that: He (Buckley) had been sent by the subcommittee to Wheeling, W. Va. to "get the facts" on whether McCarthy had used the number 205 or the number 57 in his Feb. 9, 1950 speech charging Communists in the State Dept. Buckley "came back with, I believe, 8 affidavits, and . . . all except one completely contradicted Sen. Benton's contention." Ex-Sen. Millard Tydings (D., Md.) "castigated" Buckley "for not receiving affidavits which would uphold Benton's position." Buckley "was taken back down to Wheeling with some of the other investigators" and an "attempt made to get some of the people . . . to change their affidavits to uphold Benton's position. They were unsuccessful." Then Buckley was switched to a desk job, and he resigned.[5]

*Since House membership is set at a maximum of 435, the reported "vote of 522 to nothing" is obviously erroneous; Facts on File recorded a 300-29 vote. [See Vol. VIII, p. 128H] 1—see p. 183C-D3 2—301A2 3—Vol. XI, 317E 4—p. 301B-C2 5—Vol. XI, 421E

'FBI Letter' Enters Dispute

McCarthy produced his controversial "FBI letter." Under Williams' questioning, he recalled testimony at the McCarthy-Army hearings to the effect that the body of the document was identical with a confidential FBI memo except that classified security information had been deleted. He urged committee members to read it to verify that it contained no security information.

Watkins noted that Atty. Gen. Herbert Brownell Jr. & FBI Dir. J. Edgar Hoover opposed making public the document's contents. Under the circumstances, Watkins said, "I do not think the committee [will] read" it.

Williams said he did not "see how it [the committee] can pass upon whether it [the document] is spurious or not" without looking at it. He said he did not "know how to defend our charge without . . . showing you that it is not spurious, that it purports to be just what it is, something with the security & classified information deleted from it."

Watkins said the committee would take "under advisement" the question of reading the document.

Williams made the "admission" that "I have the document in my possession, and . . . I have read it . . . and I can tell you that everything that is of a classified or security nature is manifestly deleted."

McCarthy indicated that he received the "letter" as an authentic copy which "appeared" to be a "boiled-down version of an FBI document for the purpose of distribution to security officers." "I have every reason to believe that it was & is a copy of a document in the Army files," he said.

Williams repeatedly stressed that he could not "defend the charge of spuriousness if the committee won't look at this document." Committee counsel E. Wallace Chadwick, when this complaint was directed at him, observed that this was "not my problem—nor necessarily your problem." Williams charged him with taking a "cavalier approach."[1]

●

7th Day—Sept. 10

Committee Reads 'Letter'

Watkins announced that the committee had decided to examine McCarthy's "FBI letter" and then decide whether to put it in the record. Williams gave it to the committee after McCarthy assured Watkins it was the original "letter" he had received, not a copy. McCarthy denied, under Williams' questioning, that he or a member of his staff, to his knowledge, had given Walter Winchell a copy.[2]

Watkins said after the noon recess that Atty. Gen. Brownell had told the committee he still felt the "letter" was a security matter and "cannot be declassified."[3] The committee therefore decided to accept the document in evidence but not to make it public, Watkins said.

McCarthy Quizzed on Zwicker

McCarthy, under DeFuria's questioning, conceded that he had never met Zwicker until the day he interrogated him. He said his critical remarks about Zwicker were based on Zwicker's conduct that day.

DeFuria asked whether, in questioning Zwicker, McCarthy was "trying to obtain information for legislative purposes" or was "really trying to punish the general or criticize the Army." McCarthy denied the latter purpose. He said he was seeking information (1) "to expose any incompetence or wrongdoing" and (2) "as a background for possible legislation." But "we [the Investigations Subcom.] are not restricted to getting information merely as a background for legislation," he said.

DeFuria asked McCarthy for facts on which he based his charge that Zwicker was one of the most arrogant, evasive & irritating witnesses to appear before him.

McCarthy gave "one example" of how Zwicker was "evasive": (a) originally Zwicker "indicated that he did not know" Maj. Peress "had refused to answer certain questions"; (b) "after cross-examination, he admitted that he did not know that he had refused to answer questions about communism"; (c) "after further cross-examination, he admitted" that he was "sure" he had the "impression" that Peress "had refused to answer questions about communism"; (d) Zwicker "could have simply told us the truth to begin with."

McCarthy said such conduct could not be blamed on the Presidential secrecy directive and that Zwicker had "misstated the facts." McCarthy did not "want to say he was lying [under oath] because that pre-supposes that he remembered and knew what he was doing. . . . It may have been just extremely bad memory [or] incompetence." When a witnesses "changes his story," it was the committee's job "to decide whether he is telling the truth," McCarthy said.

Reason for Dispute Given

Watkins suggested that the McCarthy-Zwicker dispute arose because McCarthy apparently felt "personnel matters were not security matters" and therefore not subject to secrecy orders whereas Zwicker felt "they were security matters" and therefore would not discuss them.

McCarthy replied: Zwicker had "answered most" questions. He objected "not to his refusal to answer" but to failure to give "straightforward . . . honest answers."

Under DeFuria's questioning, McCarthy testified: After McCarthy finished interrogating Zwicker Feb. 18, he told Zwicker to listen to what he said to the press because "if I don't give a correct résumé of the facts, I want you to call that to the attention of the press immediately." McCarthy then held his press conference and "asked Zwicker whether he had any corrections to make." Zwicker "shook his head." But after McCarthy left, Zwicker made "rather uncomplimentary remarks" about the résumé.[4]

McCarthy admitted that he revealed what took place at the Zwicker interrogation despite subcommittee rules that testimony in executive session be kept secret and released only with approval of a subcommittee majority. He said: Administrative aides of Sens. Dirksen & Potter were there, he & they constituted a majority and they agreed to release the testimony. Furthermore, Zwicker "had already released a distorted version" through Army Secy. Robert T. Stevens.[5]

DeFuria said he referred not to McCarthy's release of the transcript[6] —after Zwicker's statement had been released — but to McCarthy's press conference, which took place a few minutes after Zwicker's interrogation & 2 days before Zwicker made his public statement. McCarthy said such press conferences were "the practice of the committee"—despite the committee rule against disclosure of testimony at closed sessions.

Hayden on Committee Changes

Sen. Carl Hayden (D., Ariz.), ex-chairman of the Elections Subcom.'s parent body, the Senate Rules Com., testified on changes in the subcommittee: Sens. Gillette & Herman Welker (R., Ida.) resigned from it in Sept. 1952. Hayden checked with the Senate Parliamentarian and was informed that the remaining 3 members of the formerly 5-man subcommittee still could function as a subcommittee. Sen. A. S. Mike Monroney (D., Okla.) quit the subcommittee Nov. 20, 1952. Hayden then appointed himself to the subcommittee.

Under McCarthy's questioning, Hayden said he was unable to get the full Rules Com.'s approval of these changes as Congress was in recess. McCarthy asked whether, since this was so, the subcommittee was legally constituted. He urged Watkins to get the Parliamentarian's opinion in view of the fact that, he said, he had been requested to appear before the subcommittee only after Monroney quit. Watkins agreed.

Sen. Edwin C. Johnson (D., Colo.) told McCarthy in a letter Sept. 10 that "it would be strange indeed" if the Democratic leaders "did not loathe you" after McCarthy's "bitter & vicious attacks" on the Democrats. But Johnson said his "reporting of my estimate of attitudes & opinions held toward you 6 months ago by others does not in the slightest degree impede or impinge upon my ability to sift the facts from the fiction in this hearing." He promised to "do justice fairly & fearlessly" as a Watkins Com. member. Johnson conceded that he had criticized McCarthy but said that he also had "paid a well-deserved tribute to your relentless & persistent efforts to expose pinks, fellow-travelers & Communists" in the Govt.

Defense Secy. Wilson said in a letter to Watkins Sept. 10 that, according to the Atty. General, "the prin-

1—see p. 302C1, B-F2 2—302B-C2 3—166A1 4—61D1 5—157A-C1 6—61E1 7—301F3

ciples" of the May 17 Presidential secrecy order "are as completely applicable to any committee as they were to the Com. on Govt. Operations" during the McCarthy-Army hearings. He said Lawton & Zwicker were being told to testify about anything not ruled out by security or the directive.[1]

8th Day—Sept. 11

Elections Unit, Flanders Scored

McCarthy was cross-examined about charges that he had refused to testify before the Elections Subcommittee. He told DeFuria he had "made it clear" to the subcommittee's chairman that: He would have appeared if ordered but "would not appear merely if they accorded me the right to appear." "I had no desire to appear before that committee." "I thought they were not conducting an honest investigation" and were "stealing" from the taxpayers.[2]

McCarthy agreed that he had called Sen. Flanders "senile" but said this was justified. Flanders' "language concerning me was much stronger than that," McCarthy said. Being a Senator does not make anyone "free from criticism," he declared.[3]

Testimony on 'FBI Letter'

McCarthy again refused to name the person who gave him the 2¼-page "FBI letter." Watkins sustained Williams in objecting to DeFuria's asking McCarthy: (a) how long he had known the person who gave him the "letter"; (b) whether he had received any other classified data from him.

In regard to the "letter," McCarthy testified: He thought "only one" copy had been made on his instructions. This was for the Justice Dept. at department request. He was "reasonably certain" that Roy M. Cohn, ex-chief counsel of the Senate Investigations Subcom.,[4] had not made copies. To the best of his knowledge other McCarthy aides, including Jas. N. Juliana, Donald A. Surine & Geo. Anastos, had not seen or copied it. McCarthy had received no authority from his committee before trying to use the document in the McCarthy-Army hearings. He had not offered it to any military or civil authority, but "I am a civil authority." Since Jan. 3, 1953, aside from the "letter," "I do not think that I received anything that was classified, except through official requests."

McCarthy Backs Use of Data

McCarthy agreed that he accepted and tried to make public the 2¼-page document despite its marking of "Personal & Confidential" and his belief that it was a *bona fide* FBI letter. "I still think it should be made public," he said. He reported that "after talking to the officer [who gave it to him] and discovering that there was wrongdoing, as evidenced by this document, I felt that I had the absolute right & duty to use the information. . . . I would do it again."

Williams said that the reason the 2¼-page paper was called "classified" was because "the Atty. General has said that it is a classified document." He asked when the Atty. General had done so. McCarthy said not "until sometime during the Stevens-McCarthy hearing. [Until then] there was no indication of the classification except the heading." According to McCarthy, this was "not a classification" because officially classified documents bore a stamp noting classification & "certain excerpts from the Espionage Act."

Data 'Solicitation' Defended

DeFuria asked whether McCarthy thought that, "in the proper performance of your duties," he should have solicited Govt. employes to give him information even in violation of "the orders of the President." McCarthy replied that he did not think the President "has ever issued an order . . . to cover wrongdoing."

McCarthy answered "No" to these questions asked by DeFuria: (1) "Do you intend that the employes of the Executive Dept. shall have the right to bring you classified material even though a crime is committed . . . in abstracting the information & delivering it to you?" (2) "Do you consider . . . in the performance of your committee assignments, that you are a law enforcement officer?"

Sen. Samuel J. Ervin Jr. (D., N.C.), a committee member, asked whether McCarthy had meant to invite Govt. employes to bring him "information relating to corruption, wrongdoing, communism or treason in Govt. even though [they] could find such information only in documents marked 'Classified' by the department in which [they] were working." McCarthy's answer: "Yes." "Regardless of where they found it, I invited them to bring evidence of wrongdoing."

McCarthy said that reports of 2 Senate committees had contained solicitations "almost identical in language with the invitation which I extended to Govt. employes." The first was a 1951 Judiciary Com. report on "Subversives & Illegal Aliens." The 2d was a 1953 Internal Security subcom. report on "Interlocking Subversion in Govt. Depts." Watkins said the reports indicated no invitation to "anybody to bring in classified material or security information."

Lawton on Talk with Zwicker

Lawton was sworn in, and Watkins read into the record Defense Secy. Wilson's letter defining Lawton's authority to testify.[5]

Under DeFuria's questioning, Lawton said: He could remember no specific words Zwicker used with reference to McCarthy during a conversation in Nov. or Dec. 1953. But he could, if permitted, give a personal impression about Zwicker's attitude.

DeFuria told Williams that the purpose of his questions was to make clear that Lawton was not "gagged" by any Army or Presidential order but could present only "conclusions, which is incompetent in any judicial procedure." Williams retorted that he thought it "perfectly clear" that "this witness is being gagged by an Army order."

Williams then took up the questioning, and Lawton testified after consulting with Signal Corps lawyer John Pernice: Zwicker's conversation about McCarthy "revolved around . . . classified subjects." Lawton's "impression" was that Zwicker was "antagonistic toward Sen. McCarthy," but Lawton could not recall a "quote."

Cohn's Testimony

Cohn testified under DeFuria's questioning: He did not remember when he first saw the 2¼-page "FBI letter." He had somebody in McCarthy's office "make a copy or 2 copies or whatever it was" (Cohn did not remember the number) at the request of Robert Collier of the Mundt Com. staff, who wanted a copy for the Justice Dept. He did not know whether any McCarthy staff member had made a copy for Winchell or the press. Cohn had not done so himself.[6]

Under Williams' questioning, Cohn said: It was his "opinion that this document was not classified and I so advised Sen. McCarthy. . . . It merely bore a typewritten notation of 'Personal & Confidential'" such as was frequently used in non-classified correspondence. He regarded as classified only documents with the proper rubber stamp markings.[7]

[Cohn arrived at Keesler AF Base, Miss. Sept. 12 to begin 2 weeks' active duty as a Natl. Guard officer.][8]

9th (Last) Day—Sept. 13

Slur on Zwicker Reported

Capt. William John Woodward, Army medical officer, testified that he had accompanied Zwicker when McCarthy interrogated him and had heard McCarthy say early in the hearing, "This is the first 5th Amend. general we've had before us."

Zwicker Discusses Peress Case

Zwicker was sworn in and testified on the Peress case. He consulted several times with Lt. Col. Edward T. Johnson of the Army's Judge Advocate General Corps before giving answers that might conflict with Presidential or Army secrecy orders.

Zwicker said: He called Anastos of McCarthy's staff Jan. 23, 1954 and told him of receiving that day an order to discharge Peress. He gave Juliana of McCarthy's staff a copy of the order Feb. 13 but said he could not "discuss much information" about Peress because of a Presidential directive. He did not recall muttering at the Peress hearing Feb. 18 that McCarthy was an "s.o.b." He had no "reason for making any such remark." There were no differences of opinion between him & McCarthy before then. He had never even talked to McCarthy before McCarthy addressed him at the Peress hearing. After the Peress hearing but before his own interrogation that afternoon,

1—see p. 307F1 2—309C3, 308C3 3—301D3 4—245D3 5—309G3 6—310E1 7—310A2 8—202E1

Zwicker had "a few moments" of friendly conversation with McCarthy.

Orders Limited Testimony

Zwicker read into the record orders which had limited his testimony: (1) A Mar. 18, 1948 order by Pres. Truman against making employe loyalty records available outside the Executive Branch without the President's permission; (2) a May 28, 1952 Army regulation modifying the 1948 order to permit "names of all members of agency loyalty boards" to be made available but bar disclosure of "members who sat on particular cases."

Zwicker continued: After interrogating him, McCarthy told Zwicker he would put him "on display before the public in order that they may see just what kind of incompetent officers we have in our Army." McCarthy said at his press conference "that I had been a very balky witness, that I had failed to answer his questions, that he felt that I was covering someone . . . that he would not tolerate having officers answer . . . in this manner."

Zwicker denied that he had intended to be evasive, arrogant or irritating in testifying before McCarthy. He denied "knowingly" telling any untruth in his testimony.

Zwicker's Actions Questioned

Williams called Zwicker's attention to Par. 5 of the Peress separation order. It read: "A prompt report will be made to this [Adjutant General's] office in the event action cannot be taken without undue delay." Williams asked whether the circumstances of the case did not suggest that Zwicker should have called the Adjutant General's office.

Zwicker said they did not, the order was directed not to him but to his "immediate superior," the First Army commander, and it would have been up to the latter to decide on such action. Zwicker thought he could do nothing except discharge Peress under terms of the order.

Williams asked why Zwicker, "powerless to act" under the order, had testified Feb. 18 (under McCarthy's questioning) that if he had heard Peress had "stolen $50 the night before, he wouldn't have been discharged." Zwicker replied: Such a "hypothetical" theft would have been in "my jurisdiction" as "an offense that had not been thoroughly evaluated, passed on and orders issued" for disposition. But "the reasons for which Maj. Peress was discharged had been completely digested by the authority superior to mine. They had determined that he was to be discharged, not me."

Williams asked Zwicker whether "the fact that the chairman of a Senate committee called for the court-martial of Peress was not, in your opinion, the basis for calling the Adjutant General's office and discussing the applicability of Par. 5." Zwicker replied: He called "the representative of the commanding general, First Army, to whom this order was addressed," and reported he was about to separate Peress under the order.

Zwicker said he did not promote Peress and did not use his own initiative in discharging him. He testified that Peress' work at Camp Kilmer "was confined strictly to dentistry" and that he was not in a sensitive position. Zwicker said he was "very much opposed" to Peress' promotion & honorable discharge and had expressed this "personal opinion" to others on learning of the orders.

Testimony on Classification

Justice Dept. security officer Clifford J. Nelson testified on FBI & Justice Dept. classification procedure. He said: "Confidential" was the only classification the FBI used for security documents in Jan. 1951 (date of McCarthy's "FBI letter"). There was no regulation prescribing whether the word "Confidential" had to be printed, typed or stamped on a paper. It might be "written on in hand."[1] An Atty. General's order in Apr. 1948 said in effect "that all FBI files, records, reports, etc. are confidential." This was superseded Sept. 24, 1951 by an Executive Order setting up 4 classified categories—Top Secret, Secret, Confidential & Restricted—and providing that the words "security information" be placed on backs of classified papers.

McCarthy Aides Testify

Juliana testified that he had made only one copy of the "FBI letter" for the Justice Dept. and did not know whether anybody else had made or distributed others. Juliana said: Zwicker told him Feb. 13 that he opposed Peress' honorable discharge. This information was given to McCarthy before Zwicker was questioned.

Anastos testified: He called Zwicker Jan. 22 and said the committee "had information" of a "card-carrying Communist" major at Camp Kilmer. Zwicker called back and gave him Peress' name, serial number, service data, information that Peress had refused to answer a loyalty questionnaire & other data. Zwicker said the Army had information that Peress was or had been a CP member and that his wife, Elaine, was a member and held CP meetings "at their home." Zwicker mentioned something about "forcing Maj. Peress out of the service" by persuading "him to separate himself from the service." Next day Zwicker phoned and said he had just been informed that Peress was to get an honorable discharge in 90 days.A Anastos found Zwicker cooperative "for my purpose," and Cohn was aware of this before he interrogated Zwicker.[3] Anastos made no copies of the "FBI letter."

Williams for Changing Counsel

Williams proposed that committee counsel Chadwick & DeFuria be barred from aiding in the committee report because of their "role as advocates," and that "real counsel independent to this committee" be hired.

Watkins said the committee would consider this. But he lauded Chadwick & DeFuria and said the committee had "utmost confidence" in their "fairness." They had obeyed instructions to "get all the facts no matter whose position they supported or . . . made untenable," Watkins said.

[McCarthy said in a TV interview immediately after the hearings that Chadwick & DeFuria could "hardly write a fair report" because they "very, very vigorously prosecuted me." But the committee Sept. 14 unanimously rejected the motion that new counsel be hired for the report. Watkins reiterated the committee's "absolute confidence" in its counsel's fairness. He said committee members "will make all of the decisions.]

OTHER U.S. NEWS

Democrat Wins in Maine

Edmund S. Muskie, 40, became the first Democrat elected Governor of Maine in 20 years Sept. 13 when he defeated Republican Gov. Burton M. Cross. Muskie, a Waterville lawyer, polled 135,613 votes (54.5%) to 113,-210 for Cross, the first Maine Governor not elected to a 2d term in 40 yrs. The contest was on state issues.

Sen. Margaret Chase Smith & Maine's 3 Representatives, all Republicans, were re-elected. In defeating Prof. Paul A. Fullam of Colby College, Mrs. Smith polled 58.4% of the vote as against 71.4% in 1948. Rep. Robert Hale's 52% vote was his lowest total in 14 years. Rep. Charles P. Nelson won 54% of the ballots in his 4th term bid as against 66.8% in 1952. Rep. Clifford G. McIntire received about 60% of the vote in his district as against 76.2% in 1952.[4]

Congressional Drive Opens

Campaigning for the November Congressional elections in other states went into full swing Sept. 15.

Vice Pres. Richard M. Nixon told the Ohio Republican State Convention in Columbus Sept. 15 that GOP failure to control the 84th Congress would mean "the beginning of the end" of the Eisenhower Admin. He said a 1% voting shift against the GOP would be enough to give the Democrats control of both Houses.[5]

House Speaker Joseph W. Martin Jr. (Mass.), opening a 13-state tour in New Brunswick, N.J. Sept. 15, called this year's election "the most crucial non-Presidential balloting of our times" because Pres. Eisenhower must have a GOP Congress to complete his program.[6]

Adlai E. Stevenson, opening Ohio Sen. Thos. A. Burke's (D.) campaign in Cincinnati Sept. 15, called the Republican Party's internal quarrels "a brawl" that made the GOP "an awkward instrument of government." While Pres. Eisenhower delivered "sermonettes," he said, GOP "hatchet men" conducted "smear attacks on the flanks." Democratic gains in Maine showed that "our people are tired of this unending diet of . . . niceness, nonsense & nastiness" served by the GOP, Stevenson asserted.[7]

1—see p. 310C3 2—310F3 3—186D1 4—211B2 5—293C3 6—234A3 7—265E2

Stumping for Rep. Charles M. Howell, New Jersey's Democratic candidate for Senate against ex-Rep. Clifford P. Case (R.), Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D., Wash.) said Sept. 15 in Morristown, N.J.: the Eisenhower Admin., in regard to foreign policy, "talks tough & carries a golf putter"; the President could "move more boldly" & effectively in world affairs if Democrats controlled Congress but would be "in real trouble" if more anti-Eisenhower Republicans were elected.

Pres. Eisenhower, calling for election of a Republican Congress, said Sept. 10 in Denver that "all of us want every kind of support we can get from every channel." He met with GOP leaders from 19 states at a conference of the Mid-West & Rocky Mt. Republican State Chairmen's Assn.

GOP Natl. Chrmn. Leonard W. Hall & Democratic Natl. Chrmn. Stephen A. Mitchell both signed Sept. 14 in Washington a code, pledging a decent, honest & fair campaign, submitted to party leaders & all candidates by the Fair Campaign Practices Com., Inc. of New York.

In Brief

Anti-Communist Party drive to "utterly destroy all their (the CP's) activities in the U.S." was pledged Sept. 12 by Atty. Gen. Herbert Brownell Jr. & FBI Dir. J. Edgar Hoover after they conferred in Denver on actions the Govt. would take under new anti-Communist laws. Hoover said the total of "hard-core" Communists in the U.S. now stood at 25,000, lowest in years. Brownell, speaking in Plymouth, Mass. Sept. 13 to the Soc. of Mayflower Descendants, urged that repentant Communists contact the FBI & offer to testify with personal immunity under the new law.[3] . . . Budget deficit estimate for this fiscal year was revised upward to $4.7 billion (as against the $2.9 billion estimate made in January) by Treas. Secy. George M. Humphrey Sept. 14 due to an unforeseen drop in revenues. The estimate of fiscal-year corporation tax receipts was reduced to $18,730,000,000 from $20,264,000,000.[5] . . . Crop controls restricting cultivation of plots 10 acres or larger made idle by cutbacks on basic crops were removed (except as to basic crops) by Agri. Secy. Ezra Taft Benson Sept. 15. He said drought conditions & the need for feed crops forced this easing of the "total acreage allotment" program. He denied that it was forced by political pressure from farm areas.[6]

OBITUARIES

Mrs. Phyllis Baker Potter Astaire, 46, wife of dancer Fred Astaire; Sept. 13 in Beverly Hills, Calif.

Marika Cotopouli, 68, star tragedienne of Greek theater; Sept. 11 in Athens of heart attack.

André Derain, 74, modernist painter, a founder of Fauve movement (use of bright colors, new forms); Sept. 8 in Garches, France of auto accident injuries suffered July 20.

James A. Johnston, 79, Alcatraz Fed. Prison warden 1934-48, member Fed. Pardon & Parole Board; Sept. 12 in Washington.

Clarke Sylvester Ryan, 31, ex-asst. U.S. prosecutor who took part in prosecution of Alger Hiss, 11 top U.S. Communist leaders; Sept. 12 in N.Y. of infantile paralysis.

John Sala, 75, Italian-immigrant organizer of Amalgamated Clothing Workers of Amer. (CIO); Sept. 4 in New York.

Reinhold Schuenzel, 65, German film & stage actor; Sept. 11, Munich.

Zygmunt Sowa-Sowinski, 46, Polish miniature painter who forged passports & other documents as World War II Polish underground fighter; Sept. 12 in N.Y.

SPORTS

Winners

Auto Racing. 660-mi. Ulster Tourist Trophy race (Britain's leading road race) in Belfast Sept. 11: won by Gerard Laureau of France, driving a D. B. Panhard at 68.75 mph. avg.[7]

Golf. St. Louis Women's Open: won Sept. 12 by Betsy Rawls, 26, of Spartanburg, S.C., for $700.[8]

Horse Racing. St. Leger classic in Doncaster, Eng. Sept. 11: won by Never Say Die, Charlie Smirke up, for £13,472 ($37,721). Never Say Die, owned by Robert Sterling Clarke, 78, of New York & Upperville, Va., became the first U.S. horse to win both the Epsom Derby & St. Leger.[9] . . . Foxcatcher Natl. Cup steeplechase in Fair Hill, Md. Sept. 11: won by Mrs. Marian duPont Scott's Mighty Mo, Al Foote up, for $2,100.

Polo. U.S. open championship in Chicago: won Sept. 12 by combined Triple C (Detroit) & Meadow Brook (Westbury, N.Y.) team, 10-5 over Brandywine Polo Club of Kennett Square, Pa. Pete Bostwick of Meadow Brook scored 5 goals.[10]

Swimming. Marilyn Bell, 16, of Toronto became the first person to swim across Lake Ontario Sept. 8-9. She swam the 32 miles from Youngstown, N.Y. to Sunnyside Beach, Ont. in 20 hr. 56 min. U.S. distance swimmer Florence Chadwick, 34, of San Diego, Calif. quit after 15 miles because of a virus infection & gastritis. Cash & merchandise prizes & private donations for Miss Bell were expected to total $60,000. The swim was sponsored by the Canadian Natl. Exhibition.

•

Baseball minor league leaders in final standings Sept. 12: Amer. Assn. —Indianapolis; Intl. League—Toronto; Pacific Coast—Hollywood & San Diego tied for first.[11] . . . Paul Richards, 45, resigned as manager of the 3d-place AL Chicago White Sox Sept. 14 to become general manager of the last-place AL Baltimore Orioles. Marty Marion, 37, Chicago coach, became manager of the White Sox through the season and 1955.[12]

MISCELLANEOUS

Disasters

Earthquakes struck Orleansville & neighboring localities in the Cheliff River Valley of northern Algeria Sept. 9-12, killing at least 1,657 persons, injuring 2,500 and leaving at least 10,000 homeless. 95% of the buildings in Orleansville (pop. 32,500) were rendered uninhabitable.

Kyushu Island was hit hardest as a 100-mph. typhoon swept across Japan Sept. 13-14. At least 25 persons were killed, 66 injured, 16 were missing on Kyushu.

At least 22 persons were killed as a hurricane dubbed Edna (5th of the season) swept up the U.S. Atlantic coast from Cape Hatteras, N.C. to Maine & Nova Scotia Sept. 10-11. $50 million in property losses were reported. Maine was the state hardest hit (9 persons drowned, an estimated $17 million in damage). ⅔ of Nova Scotia's $4 million bumper apple crop was destroyed. Pres. Eisenhower designated parts of Maine as disaster areas Sept. 13.

Death toll in Hurricane Carol was reported Sept. 11 as 68 with property damage near $500 million.[13]

NAMES IN THE NEWS

Lee Ann Meriwether, 19, of San Francisco, was chosen Miss America of 1955 in Atlantic City Sept. 11. The brunette San Francisco City College sophomore, a dramatics student, was to earn about $60,000 during the next 12 mos. in cash, gifts & a scholarship. . . . Nicholas Levitsky, 25, stateless Russian-born refugee from Red China on his way to the Dominican Republic, arived in New York Sept. 13 by plane but was sent back to Paris same day. Immigration authorities said he was virtually undocumented & would become a public charge of the U.S. if the Dominican Republic changed its mind & rejected him. Brazil had revoked a visa for him and turned him back to France last year.

Married: Dr. Peter Lindstrom, 47, ex-husband of actress Ingrid Bergman, & Dr. Agnes Rovnanek, 26, Czech-born pediatrician; Sept. 9, Pittsburgh, Pa.[14]

Divorced: Andrea Luckenbach Hammer, 33, from Frederick Hammer, 46, under 5-yr. prison sentence for shooting & wounding her at Delaware Park Race Track June 28; Sept. 10 in Lexington, Ky.[15]

NEW YORK THEATER

Dear Charles. Tallullah Bankhead as writer who has 3 children born out of wedlock, decides she much choose one of the fathers & marry him. Comedy by Marc-Gilbert Sauvajon & Frederick Jackson, adapted by Alan Melville. Staged by Edmund Baylies. Presented by Richard Aldrich & Richard Myers in assn. with Julius Fleischmann. With Fred Keating, Robert Coote, Werner Klemperer, Hugh Reilly, Alice Pearce, Norah Howard, Larry Robinson, Grace Raynor, Tom Raynor. Sept. 15 at Morosco. (3-3-1)*

*First figure—favorable reviews; 2d—mixed; 3d—unfavorable. [See p. 6B3] E—see p. 268E2 2—302F3 3—293B-D3 4—285A1 5—254A3 6—267D2 7—288C1 8—32C1 9—204D3 10—Vol. XIII, 300D2 11—p. 304E1 12—Vol. XIII, 408D2; X, 327F 13—p. 304B2 14—Vol. XIII, 204L 15—p. 264G2